

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-36 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 14, and 24 have been amended.

Claim 38 has been added. Support for this amendment is found at least at Applicants' Specification, p.11, ll.13-18.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as purportedly being indefinite for purportedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Office Action (at pages 3-4) suggests that the previously made amendments to claims 1 and 24 signify that business components and selected operations that can be performed on business components are separate from the application program. Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 24, as amended, reads:

24. A method comprising:
auditing an application program wherein said auditing comprises creating an audit trail; and
using the application program to perform audit trail functions comprising
generating a list of business components included in the application program, wherein
a business component of the list of business components comprises
one or more fields, wherein
the fields correspond to records in a database, and
the database is separate from the application program,
presenting the list of business components to a user,
allowing the user to select for auditing a selected business component,
presenting a list of operations that can be performed on the selected business component to the user,
allowing the user to select for auditing one or more selected operations-for the selected business component, and
providing the audit trail to the database associated with the fields of the business component.

Claim 24 provides for “a list of business components included in the application program.” Thus, the Office Action’s assertion that a business component is claimed to be separate from the application is inconsistent with the claim language. The inclusive language of the claims finds support at least in Figure 1 of the original application.

However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicants have included additional clarifying amendments to claims 1 and 24 that clearly establish that it is the database which is separate from the application program, not the business components or the operations that can be performed upon the business components.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 24 are fully compliant with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and accordingly request withdrawal of the rejection of these claims and indication of allowability of the same.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 7-16, 18-27 and 29-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,070,177 issued to Kao et al. (“Kao”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 14, and 24 include limitations of substantially the following form:

means for selecting for auditing a business component from the one or more business components,
means for selecting for auditing one or more selected operations on the business component.

See e.g., Claim 1 (amended). Applicants respectfully submit that Kao does not teach these limitations.

Applicants have amended the independent claims to more clearly reflect that a business component is what is *selected for auditing*. That is, selection of a particular business component designates that business component as one to be audited. A user may specify which particular business components the user desires to include in an audit.

The Office Action cites to the following sections of Kao as purportedly teaching a “means for selecting a business component to be audited from one or more business components.”

FIG. 8 is a flowchart that illustrates the steps of creating an audit trail for a database form or document that is transmitted among users in a network according to a method of the present invention. In step 802, a user selects a database form to use for a particular request and enters data in the appropriate fields of the form to formulate a request.

Kao, col.10, ll.8-13 (cited at Office Action, p.4). The cited passage discloses selection of a form to use. The Office Action equates this form with a business component.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed business components and Kao's forms are not equivalent. A business component, as claimed, comprises one or more fields, the fields being records in a database. A form is simply "a template that provides data entry fields and associated labels." Kao, col.5, ll.2-4. Additionally, the cited passage explicitly states that the form is selected *to use* for a request. The claims provide that a business component is selected *for audit*. Selecting a form to use means that a user wishes to enter data of the type collected by that particular form. Selecting a business record for auditing means that a user wishes to create an audit trail for that particular business record. Applicants respectfully submit that Kao's "use" and the claimed "auditing" are not the same or equivalent.

A similar distinction is even more clearly drawn with regard to the claimed "selecting for auditing one or more selected operations on the business component." The Office Action equates selecting one or more selected operations on the business component with modifying data in a database form. *See*, Office Action, p.4 (citing Kao, col. 5, ll. 11-13). As an initial matter, Applicants respectfully submit that data in a form is not the same as a selected operation. The "selected operations" claimed include not only modification, but at least creation, deletion, and reproduction as well. *See e.g.*, Specification, p.14, ll.8-14. Second, Applicants submit that the claimed selection for auditing of one or more of these operations is not the same as modifying data in a form. The claimed feature designates from among a plurality of possible operations which to include in an audit trail. Modifying data is simply data entry. The two are not the same or equivalent.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited sections of Kao fail to disclose each claim limitation of amended claims 1, 14, and 24. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of these rejections and indication of allowability of these claims.

Regarding dependent claim 10, the Office Action (at pages 8-9) asserts that Kao discloses the claimed querying one or more of the audit transaction records. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited section of Kao reads:

Audit trail display area 304 lists such information as the name or ID of the user who created the form, the names or ID's of each of the users who received the form, the data and time of reception, any action taken by each user, and other such information. In this manner, the audit trail display area 304 provides a means by which the transmission history and actions taken regarding a particular document, set of data, or database form may be viewed by the users of the document or form.

Kao, col.5, ll. 40-48. The cited passage describes the area of a display screen which displays an audit trail. The cited section Kao fails to disclose any capability to query one or more audit transaction records. The above referenced elements of Kao's Fig. 3 simply show a list of users and actions (the actions presumably having been taken by those users.) This is not the same as the claimed querying one or more audit transaction records. Querying one or more audit transaction records generally results in the display of only selected records, namely those that match the queried term. *See*, Application, p.16, ll.5-10. On the other hand, the cited section of Kao displays no capability to display only records that match a query. Consequently, Kao fails to disclose each element of claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claim 10 is patentable over the cited reference and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 10 and give indication of the allowability of same.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1, 14, 24, and 36 (which incorporates the limitations of claim 24,) are in condition for allowance, as are the claims which depend therefrom. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections as to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6, 17 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kao in view of U.S. Patent 6,056,786 issued to Rivera et al., ("Rivera"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Kao fails to teach each limitation contained in amended claims 1, 14, and 24. Specifically, Applicants submit that Kao fails to teach, at least, the following claimed limitations:

means for selecting for auditing a business component from the one or more business components,
means for selecting for auditing one or more selected operations on the business component.

See e.g., Claim 1 (amended). Rivera is not cited for the proposition that it teaches these limitations. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Kao, Rivera, and any permissible combination of the two fails to teach each limitation of claims 1, 14, and 24.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1, 14, 24, and 36 (which incorporates the limitations of claim 24,) are in condition for allowance, as are the claims which depend therefrom. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections as to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

Added Claim

Applicants have added claim 38 which discloses a means for selectively activating and deactivating the audit trail. This is supported at least by the original Application at p.11, ll.13-18, and therefore does not add new matter. Applicants respectfully submit this feature further distinguishes over the cited references. Kao discloses that "[T]he audit trail display area is always transmitted along with, and displayed with the document or form with which it is associated." Kao, col.5, ll.49-51. Neither Kao nor Rivera discloses any means to selectively activate and deactivate the audit trail. Accordingly, this claim is patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5092.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,



Shawn Doman
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 60,362
Telephone: (512) 439-5092
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099